

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 will remain in this application after entry of this amendment. Entry of the amendment and reconsideration of the application are requested.

The allowance of claims 8 and 12 is acknowledged. Claim 7 is rewritten above to include the previously omitted subject matter of claim 2 and should now be allowable along with claims 8 and 12.

Each of independent claims 1, 6, 13-15, and 17-19 is again rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 1,593,242 to Cutler. Reconsideration is requested. As noted in the Reply filed September 20, 2005, each of the independent claims mentioned reflects features discussed in specification paragraph 0026 and illustrated by way of example in Figure 4 of the present application. It is again submitted that the Cutler flanges 36, considered "guides" by the Examiner, are not "defined as one part with" a front wall of a front carrying structure as each of the independent claims mentioned above requires. While it is acknowledged that claim limitations should be interpreted as broadly as is reasonable during examination, it is not reasonable to either identify the Cutler outer casing or shell 1 as a front wall of a front carrying structure as each independent claim mentioned requires or to conclude that flanges 36 are "defined as one part with" such a front wall as each independent claim referred to recites. It is again submitted that none of independent claims 1, 6, 13-15, and 17-19 above is presently anticipated by the Cutler patent.

Each of independent claims 1, 6, 13, 15, and 17-19 is also again rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,742,881 to Kawaguchi et al. Reconsideration is requested. As noted in the Reply filed September 20, 2005, the Kawaguchi et al. bracket 10 and resilient member 11, considered "guides" by the Examiner, are not "defined as one part with" a front wall of a front carrying structure as each of independent claims 1, 6, 13, 15, and 17-19 requires. The discussion of a "wall of casing 1" appearing, for example, in lines 1-3 and 13-15 on page 5 of the Office Action is completely unclear, as reference number 1 of the Kawaguchi et al. patent identifies an overall vehicle body rather than any casing wall. The Examiner's attention is directed, for example, to line 13 in column 2 of the Kawaguchi et al. patent. The conclusion that independent claims 1, 6, 13, 15, and 17-19 are anticipated by the Kawaguchi et al. patent disclosure appears to be based on an erroneous interpretation of that disclosure, and none of these independent claims as it appears above is anticipated by the Kawaguchi et al. patent.

U.S. Patent 5,271,473 to Ikeda et al. is relied on as a secondary reference to reject dependent claims 9-11. As noted previously, however, the Ikeda et al. patent disclosure does not provide any suggestion to modify either the Cutler radiator or the Kawaguchi et al. apparatus so as to meet the limitations discussed above, and it is respectfully submitted that each of claims 1, 6, 13-15, and 17-19 is patentable. Claims 2-5 and 9-11 depend on claim 1 and are also

patentable. After entry of this amendment, therefore, all claims in this application will be patentable. Entry of the amendment is in order and is again requested.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an extension of time sufficient to effect a timely response. Please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket # 225/49907).

March 23, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Richard R. Diefendorf
Registration No. 32,390

CROWELL & MORING, LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
RRD:rd